

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Jimmy W. Wilson,)	C/A No. 5:15-cv-00025-MBS-KDW
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
)	(partial summary dismissal)
Dr. Way;)	
HCA Nurse Darrell Harrison;)	
Dr. McRee;)	
SCDC Director Mr. Stirling,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This is a civil action filed pro se by a state prison inmate. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(e) (D.S.C.), this magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters in such pro se cases and to submit findings and recommendations to the district court. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e); 1915A (as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal).

I. Factual and Procedural Background

Plaintiff is a prisoner at MacDougall Correctional Institution, part of the South Carolina Department of Corrections (“SCDC”) prison system. Compl. 2, ECF No. 1. In the Complaint brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Plaintiff alleges cruel and unusual punishment and medical indifference arising from a decision by Defendants Way and McRee to remove him from a narcotic medication that he had been taking to treat chronic medical conditions. *Id.* at 3, 5. Plaintiff alleges that he suffered severe withdrawal side effects for several days without assistance and was then placed on corrective medications. *Id.* at 6. He also alleges that his chronic conditions are not being treated by SCDC in the manner prescribed by outside specialists

who Plaintiff has seen and that, as a result, he is in constant pain. *Id.* at 7-8. It appears from the Complaint that Defendants Way, McRee, and Harrison were personally involved in providing or in making decisions about providing medical care to Plaintiff; however, the only allegation against Defendant Stirling¹ is that he “is legally responsible for the overall operation of [SCDC]” *Id.* at 5. Plaintiff sues all Defendants individually and officially. ECF No. 9. He seeks declaratory and injunctive relief and damages. Compl. 9-10, ECF No. 1.

II. Standard of Review

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of Plaintiff’s pro se Complaint filed in this case. This review has been conducted pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § § 1915, 1915A, and the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1996, and in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Md. House of Corr.*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983); *Boyce v. Alizaduh*, 595 F.2d 948 (4th Cir. 1979).

Pro se complaints are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978), and a federal district court is charged with liberally construing a complaint filed by a pro se litigant to allow the development of a potentially meritorious case. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007). When a federal court is evaluating a pro se complaint, the plaintiff’s allegations are assumed to be true. *De’Lonta v. Angelone*, 330 F.3d 630, 630 n.1 (4th Cir. 2003). Nevertheless, the requirement of liberal construction does not mean that this Court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege

¹ Plaintiff spells this Defendant’s name incorrectly as “Sterling.” By way of the Order issued contemporaneously with this Report, the Clerk of Court is being directed to correct the spelling on the docket.

facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387, 391 (4th Cir. 1990). Even under this less stringent standard, the Complaint filed in this case is subject to partial summary dismissal under the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

III. Discussion

To assert a plausible § 1983 claim against any particular public official, a “causal connection” or “affirmative link” must exist between the conduct of which the plaintiff complains and the official sued. *See Kentucky v. Graham*, 473 U.S. 159 (1985); *Wolf-Lillie v. Sonquist*, 699 F.2d 864, 869 (7th Cir. 1983). As a general rule, the doctrine of vicarious liability or *respondeat superior* is not available to a § 1983 plaintiff as a means to create liability of a state-actor supervisor for the acts of his/her subordinate. *See Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658, 694 (1978). There is a limited exception to the prohibition against imposing *respondeat superior* or vicarious liability on supervisory personnel in § 1983 cases, which has been enunciated in cases such as *Slakan v. Porter*, 737 F.2d 368, 370-75 (4th Cir. 1984). Supervisory officials like SCDC Director Stirling may be held liable in certain circumstances for the constitutional injuries inflicted by their subordinates so long as the facts alleged satisfy the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals’ established three-part test for supervisory liability under § 1983: “(1) that the supervisor had actual or constructive knowledge that his subordinate was engaged in conduct that posed ‘a pervasive and unreasonable risk’ of constitutional injury to citizens like the plaintiff; (2) that the supervisor’s response to that knowledge was so inadequate as to show ‘deliberate indifference to or tacit authorization of the alleged offensive practices,’; and (3) that there was an ‘affirmative causal link’ between the supervisor’s inaction and the

particular constitutional injury suffered by the plaintiff.” *Shaw v. Stroud*, 13 F.3d 791, 799 (4th Cir. 1994) (citations omitted).


In *Randall v. Prince George’s County*, 302 F.3d 188, 206 (4th Cir. 2002), the Fourth Circuit concluded that, “[u]nder the first prong of *Shaw*, the conduct engaged in by the supervisor’s subordinates must be ‘pervasive,’ meaning that the ‘conduct is widespread, or at least has been used on several different occasions.’” Furthermore, in establishing “deliberate indifference” under *Shaw*’s second prong, a plaintiff “[o]rdinarily . . . cannot satisfy his burden of proof by pointing to a single incident or isolated incidents . . . for a supervisor cannot be expected . . . to guard against the deliberate criminal acts of his properly trained employees when he has no basis upon which to anticipate the misconduct.” *Id.* (quoting *Slakan*, 737 F.2d at 373); *see also Green v. Beck*, No. 12-7279, 2013 WL 4517028, *2 (4th Cir. Aug. 27, 2013) (alleged failure of supervisory officials to investigate grievances not sufficient to establish liability under § 1983).

The *Slaken* exception is not adequately pleaded in this case because there are no allegations of any personal knowledge (or even subjective knowledge) on Director Stirling’s part of the problems that Plaintiff alleges he has been having with the medical staff at MacDougall Correctional Institution. Thus, regardless of how pervasive the alleged problems might be, Stirling cannot be held liable for them simply based on his job as the overall supervisor at SCDC. Moreover, there are no allegations from which any potential responsibility of Stirling for an unconstitutional SCDC policy or custom could be established. The lack of any allegations establishing a plausible § 1983 claim against Defendant Stirling requires that the Complaint be partially summarily dismissed insofar as it seeks to hold him liable for damages.

IV. Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the district court partially dismiss the Complaint in this case without prejudice as to Defendant Stirling. *See Brown v. Briscoe*, 998 F.2d 201, 202-04 (4th Cir. 1993); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); 28 U.S.C. § 1915A (as soon as possible after docketing, district courts should review prisoner cases to determine whether they are subject to summary dismissal). The Complaint should be served on the remaining Defendants.

IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Kaymani D. West". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Kaymani" being more prominent than the last name "West".

February 5, 2015
Florence, South Carolina

Kaymani D. West
United States Magistrate Judge

**The parties are directed to note the important information in the attached
“Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation.”**

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

**Robin L. Blume, Clerk
United States District Court
Post Office Box 2317
Florence, South Carolina 29503**

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).